Topics
My posts
Drafts
Preferences
More
CATEGORIES
Philosophy
Society, Government...
Science, Technology,...
Psychology and Mind
Religion and Spiritua...
Creative Writing

Oct 1

70 / 198
Dec 14

2d ago

Jupiter123 abc1231 2 Belinda 10d

There is no chaos in the cosmos Belinda.It's all perfectly structured.

Vibration is the communication means in the cosmos throughout.

For vibration to occur you need to balance the attractive and repulsive electromagnetic force interactions NN,NS,SN,SS that exist right now between all spinning particles with N and S poles which make up all matter (N/S+N/S).This is what holds all matter together IN REALITY!!!

You have to do this to produce BINARY CODE!!! (0/1+0/1)

Vibratory balancing all matter in the way described above results in varying frequency electromagnetic energy waves CONTAINING BINARY DATA!!! to be emitted from all matter types.The energy emitted is regulated by the spin speed of the particles which make up the matter types because the spin speed of particles changes the frequency the particles vibrate at.

It's a well know scientific FACT that the physical body machine picks up varying frequency electromagnetic energy waves emitted from vibrating matter.Your machine body then converts these analogue waves into binary electrical signals that form part of the software programming that operates it.

Give up people you are wasting your time continually pursuing an atheistic religious cults agenda.

It doesn't work!!!

The *JWT* is now providing definitive confirmation that all of the religious cult of atheism's psuedo science is precisely that.

daniel j lavender 1 7d

> Silenus:
>
> > daniel_j_lavender:
> >
> > Moreover, how do you define "energy"? Is all really energy? Is silence energy? Are numbers energy?
> >
> > Energy, from the Greek Ev-Εργο…at work in the process of creating.
> >
> > I define energy as interactive….
>
> This is a rather ambiguous answer. You haven't provided a clear definition. What is "work"? What is "creating"?
>
> In fact you've presented two definitions:
>
> > Silenus:
> >
> > Energy, from the Greek Ev-Εργο…at work in the process of creating.
>
> and:
>
> > Silenus:
> >
> > I define energy as interactive
>
> Which is it?
>
> How does the number five fit within "at work in the process of creating"? How does silence fit within "at work in the process of creating"? How does emptiness fit within "at work in the process of creating"?
>
> If all is energy why need such distinction? Why distinguish thought from stone? Why distinguish letter from number? Why distinguish emptiness from fullness? Why distinguish material from immaterial? Why distinguish any thing from any other?
>
> Is it accurate to say all is energy? Is a true vacuum energy? Are thoughts, are concepts themselves energy or are they emergent from such interaction?
>
> To say all is energy is to force an incredibly immense variety of things into a rather specific, yet vague, category.
>
> You also skipped this:
>
> > daniel j lavender:
> >
> > Is emptiness energy? Or is emptiness a quality of a region of existence lacking energy?
>
> How does either definition of energy you've provided resolve such a situation? I contend neither does.
>
> Your initial statement was:
>
> > Silenus:
> >
> > All is energy.
>
> The term "is" indicates being or existence. Regardless what follows "is" existence is the subject. All is, indicating existence. All is existence, including energy.
>
> The concept you present integrates into the ontology as just that, a concept. It is perceived or interacted with, at least in part.
>
> You present energy as some ambiguous concept while ineffectively attempting to reify it as tangible phenomena.
>
> Your definition(s) cannot stand on their own. There is no method to substantiate them. In this sense your statement "all is energy" is rather empty. What is energy? Where is energy? How is it substantiated?
>
> I maintain existence, being, is the term of maximal generality, not energy. The term existence, as presented, is also functional, allowing substantiation of being. The terms and concepts you present offer no such functionality.
>
> The provided terminology is much more natural and intuitive as well. For example, referring to a coconut or a palm tree as existence is much more intuitive than referring to a coconut or a palm tree as energy.

3 Replies